

Appl. No.: 09/745,290
Filed: December 20, 2000
Amdt. dated 03/23/2006

REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to the final Office Action dated January 3, 2006. Claims 1-40, 42-50 and 52-54 currently stand rejected.

In light of the remarks presented below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all now-pending claims of the present application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-40, 42-50 and 52-54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tso et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,733, hereinafter "Tso") in view of Tsimelzon (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,388).

Independent claim 1 recites, inter alia, segmenting the digital document into subdocuments, and transmitting fewer than all of the subdocuments over the communication channel in response to the request, wherein at least one of the subdocuments transmitted includes a link to an adjacent subdocument. In other words, a full document is segmented into multiple subdocuments, at least one of which contains links to adjacent subdocuments.

Tso discloses a system for dynamically transcoding data transmitted between computers via a transcoder (20) (col. 2, lines 44-49). The transcoder (20) includes a parser (22) and a plurality of transcode service providers (24) (col. 3, lines 8-10). The parser (22) selectively invokes one or more transcode service providers (24) based upon predetermined selection criterion (col. 3, lines 13-16). As such, the transcode service providers (24) may compress or scale data content (col. 3, lines 51-54). Thus, the transcoder (20) of Tso transcodes entire documents such that a received document is revised and transmitted as an entire revised document. Tso fails to teach or suggest that at least one of the subdocuments transmitted includes a link to an adjacent subdocument as claimed in independent claim 1, and is not cited as teaching such feature.

Accordingly, the Office Action cites Tsimelzon as teaching the above recited feature of independent claim 1. Tsimelzon is directed to a method and apparatus for selecting and viewing portions of web pages. Tsimelzon discloses "web clipping" in which a link to the user's startpage is created and downloaded into the user's handheld device (col. 10, lines 47-49). Using

Appl. No.: 09/745,290
Filed: December 20, 2000
Amdt. dated 03/23/2006

the web clipping function, a user may select a link from the startpage to the shortpage to permit the user to access a stored shortpage from the startpage. Tsimelzon discloses additional links as well. For example, a link to the startpage page (col. 9, line 17), a link to a notification page (col. 9, line 18), a link to a help page (col. 9, line 18), a link to edit a shortpage (col. 9, line 19), and a link to a full page upon which the shortpage is based (col. 9, lines 20-21). However, none of the links disclosed in Tsimelzon is a link in a subdocument to an adjacent subdocument as claimed in independent claim 1. Furthermore, Tsimelzon fails to teach any link to a subdocument, since a shortpage is a collection of webpage elements and thus, not analogous to a subdocument.

The Office Action cites FIG. 9, FIG. 13, col. 2, lines 5-24 and 45-65, col. 8, line 55 to col. 9, line 5, and col. 10, line 37 to col. 11, line 20 as teaching at least one of the subdocuments transmitted includes a link to an adjacent subdocument. Despite a careful reading of the cited passages, Applicants are unable to find any disclosure in the cited passages that would amount to a teaching or suggestion that at least one of the subdocuments transmitted includes a link to an adjacent subdocument as claimed in independent claim 1. The Office Action also cited, in response to Applicants' previous arguments, that such feature is particularly taught in FIGS 4 and 13 and at col. 9, line 41 to col. 10, line 14. However, neither FIG. 4 nor FIG. 14 contains any disclosure regarding links to subdocuments, much less a link to an adjacent subdocument as claimed in the claimed invention. Meanwhile, col. 9, line 41 to col. 10, line 14 of Tsimelzon only discloses that if a web page includes a link to another web page, "server 120 will check the link to determine whether it is a shortpage" (col. 10, lines 11-14). Thus, even assuming for the sake of argument that a shortpage of Tsimelzon is analogous to a subdocument of the claimed invention (an assumption with which Applicants expressly disagree), Tsimelzon still fails to teach or suggest any link from one shortpage to an adjacent shortpage (i.e. a subdocument containing a link to an adjacent subdocument). Instead, the cited passage discloses that a link in a page will be checked to determine if the link is a link to a shortpage. Thus, Applicants submit that the entirety of Tsimelzon, in general, and the cited passages of Tsimelzon, in particular, fail to teach or suggest at least one of the subdocuments transmitted includes a link to an adjacent subdocument as claimed in independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request

Appl. No.: 09/745,290
Filed: December 20, 2000
Amdt. dated 03/23/2006

that, if the Examiner persists in this rejection, the Examiner should articulate where such feature is taught or suggested in Tsimelzon for the sake of completeness of the record for appeal.

Since Tso and Tsimelzon each fail to teach or suggest the aforementioned features of independent claim 1, any combination of Tso and Tsimelzon also fails to teach or suggest the subject matter of independent claim 1. Thus, Tso and Tsimelzon, taken either individually or in combination, do not anticipate, or render independent claim 1 obvious. Independent claims 26, 27, 28, 33 and 43 include similar recitations to those of independent claim 1 with respect to subdocuments and associated links to adjacent subdocuments. Thus, independent claims 26, 27, 28, 33 and 43 are patentable for at least those reasons given above for independent claim 1. Claims 2-25, 29-32, 34-40, 42, 44-50 and 52-54 depend either directly or indirectly from corresponding ones of independent claims 1, 26, 27, 28, 33 and 43, and thus include all the recitations of their corresponding independent claims. Therefore, dependent claims 2-25, 29-32, 34-40, 42, 44-50 and 52-54 are patentable for at least the reasons given above for independent claims 1, 26, 27, 28, 33 and 43.

Accordingly, for all the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 1-40, 42-50 and 52-54 are overcome.

Appl. No.: 09/745,290
Filed: December 20, 2000
Amdt. dated 03/23/2006

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks presented above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested in due course. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present application.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Chad L. Thorson
Registration No. 55,675

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the US Patent and Trademark Office at
Fax No. (703) 872-9306 on the date shown below.


Nancy McPartland

3-23-06
Date